UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF BOTANY
BERKELEY

Feb. 17, 1921 (Thurs P.M.)

Dear Merry:-

Your last package came at the herbarium today and I gave it a cursory once-over. I will look it over carefully soon. I am enclosing a description of a new species of Pentstemon, that I have taken the liberty of calling P. Mungii. It is a fine clear cut species and I feel very sure of its distinctness. It is that red flowered plant you labeled P. Eatoni. I worked over P. Stephensii Brand and I am convinced that it (the species) is only a form of P. Clevelandii that differs in its glabrous instead of bearded sterile filament. I think it ought to be reduced to a variety. The large white-flowered Pentstemon is typical P. Palmeri!; our mt. plant going under that name is certainly a variety at least and probably will have to be called P. Grenellii (I think that is the name) as Miss Eastwood described the San Gabriel plant some time ago in the Bot. Gaz. I have not looked the matter up and am only using my memory for this last. P. calycosus checks perfectly with the type specimen. I do not think Gymnogramme or Pellaea are worth mentioning tho the Felix is probably noteworthy. Have you noted the recent reversion of the golden-backs in Rhodora (under Pityrogramme)? That cucurbit is Brandegeea parviflora a good find but hardly noteworthy. Dr Jepson saw it & went and got quite enthusiastic over the good fruits your collection possessed. You were correct after all concerning the Yuccas. Y. Mohavensis was correctly named and Y. baccata is present in a large & small flowered form. Mr Parish got your cactus material & will no doubt report to you directly. We might make some good notes on our Yucca material.

I have gone over your list carefully and can not help but feel that too much is included that is of little import. If you are giving additions to B.s list of the Prov. Mts or Mr Parishes San Bernardino Mt. paper I think that a separate heading should be made, for many of the plants B did not list are common in the desert area (the reason why B. did not list them) while in regards the S.B. Mts I think we ought to turn the records over to Mr. Parish

as he is getting out a list of additions. I really think that a list of real additions to California or one containing notes on obscure species is much better, even if short, than a longer list padded with unimportant data. What I consider the real important things and those upon which we can make a real contribution I have listed on the enclosed paper. Of course we can list as much more as you like but I hope that that will be not much more. How do you want me to go about revising this up. Do you want to dash off the data and send it up to me for criticism & additions or vice versa or had we better wait until we can get our heads together the when that is possible I shall not be able to check up things.

I am naming most of the specimens rather carefully but things like Mentzelias, Nemacladus, Chamaesyce, etc I am passing over for want of time as I do not consider them worth fooling with short of a complete revision. I think they had best be let accumulate until such time as you or someone else turns to them with the view of revision. Anyway those critical groups are as mixed in the herb. up here as they are at Pomona.

Was over to the Cal. Acad yesterday and got all the dope about the Lower Cal trip. They are to leave SF the 19th of March & due to leave Guaymas the 1st of April. They will devote all their time to the islands in the Gulf of Cal. & will be out somewhere between 3 & 4 months. I will plan to be at home for at least a week and am planning to spend a good part of that over at the College to begin to get ready for me.

Well I guess that is all I have to tell now. I'll write you again soon, as ever

Sincerely yours

J. M. Johnston